

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,406	06/26/2003	Mohamad Shaheen	42P16009	8443
7590 06/08/2005			EXAMINER	
Lester J. Vincent			LOKE, STEVEN HO YIN	
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP Seventh Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
12400 Wilshire Boulevard			2811	
Los Angeles, CA 90025			DATE MAILED: 06/08/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summan	10/608,406	SHAHEEN ET AL.	(Buns
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Steven Loke	2811	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	!SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing dale of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status		·	
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 N	larch 2005.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa closed in accordance with the practice under <i>b</i>			erits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-8 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-6 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7,8 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Applicati Inity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s)	_		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da		
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date			52)

Application/Control Number: 10/608,406 Page 2

Art Unit: 2811

1. Claims 1 and 4 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 1, line 9, the phrases "439C" and "451C" are unclear whether they are being referred to "439 degrees C" and "451 degrees C", respectively. Claim 4, line 2, the phrases "419C" and "430C" are unclear whether they are being referred to "419 degrees C" and "430 degrees C". Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1, the parent claim of claim 4, discloses the first annealing temperature is between approximately 439 degrees C and approximately 451 degrees C. However, it is unclear why claim 4 discloses the first annealing temperature is between approximately 419 degrees C and approximately 430 degrees C. The first annealing temperature of claim 4 is outside the range of the annealing temperature of claim 1. The annealing temperature of claim 1 is used for the thermal cleave operation for the wafer separation while the annealing temperature of claim 4 is used for the mechanical cleave operation for the wafer separation (paragraph [0029] of applicant's specification). It is believed that claim 4 should not depend upon claim 1.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Bryan.

In regards to claim 1, Bryan shows all the elements of the claimed invention in figs.

1-6. It is an integrated circuit (col. 1, lines 8-19), comprising: a semiconductor substrate [31]; a device layer [19] coupled to the substrate, the device layer having been coupled to the substrate via a transfer process comprising: doping the device layer with a first quantity of a first ionic material [17] (silicon) and a second quantity of a second ionic material [22] (hydrogen); annealing (heating) (col. 5, lines 44-54, col. 6, lines 1-5) the device layer and semiconductor substrate at a first annealing temperature.

In regards to claim 1, the process limitation of how the device layer is formed has no patentable weight in claim drawn to structure. Note that a product by process claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and In re Marosi et al, 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability of the final product per se which must be determined in a product by process claim, and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious product by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in product by process claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above caselaw makes clear.

Art Unit: 2811

Therefore, the phrase "epitaxial layer", the phrase "a transfer process", and the phrase "annealing the epitaxial layer and semiconductor substrate at a first annealing temperature, wherein the first annealing temperature is between approximately 439C and approximately 451C" are thus non-limiting.

In regards to claim 2, Bryan further discloses the sum of the first quantity of the first ionic material (10¹⁴ atoms/cm²) and the second quantity of the second ionic material (10¹⁴ atoms/cm²) is no greater than approximately 2x10¹⁶ cm⁻².

In regards to claim 6, Bryan further discloses the second ionic material comprises hydrogen ions to react with the device layer at an energy level of approximately 40 KeV (col. 4, lines 57-59).

5. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Loke whose telephone number is (571) 272-1657. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:20 am to 5:50 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on (571) 272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/608,406

Art Unit: 2811

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

sl June 5, 2005 Steven Loke Primary Examiner Page 5